

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,947	08/13/2004	Michael P. Chudzik	FIS920040092US2	4946
45094	7590 05/23/2006		EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN, WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO LLC			HE, AMY	
75 STATE ST 14TH FL	Ľ		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALBANY, N	7 12207		2858	

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Y		/_
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/710,947	CHUDZIK ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Amy He	2858	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address	;
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MO , cause the application to become A	ICATION.  I reply be timely filed  INTHS from the mailing date of this communications  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)□ 2a)□ 3)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal ma		its is
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.		
Applicat	ion Papers	•		
10)⊠ 11)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>13 August 2004</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	a)⊠ accepted or b)□ o drawing(s) be held in abeya tion is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	
•	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document  2. Certified copies of the priority document  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document  application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in rity documents have bee u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No In received in this National Stag	e
2) Notion Notion Notion Notion	nt(s)  ce of References Cited (PTO-892)  ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  er No(s)/Mail Date 8/13/04.	Paper N	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	)

Art Unit: 2858

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains informality phrase "comprises" (on line 4). Replace the phrase with --includes--. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12,14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6, 759,255).

As for claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 14 and 20, Xu discloses a method/system (in Figure 1; abstract) for determining characteristic of a material on a substrate, comprising:

depositing the material(col. 6, lines 15-16) on the substrate using a first value of a growth metric (a first time);

depositing an amount of charge on a surface of the material (step 12);

repeatedly measuring a surface voltage of the material until an onset of tunneling to provide a Vtunnel value (step 18);

Art Unit: 2858

repeating the above steps for different values of the growth metric (repeated at a second time, col. 8, lines 7-14; Figure 8 with Etunnel plotted against time); and

comparing the Vtunnel values (Vtunnel values for the two different type of metal contaminations by two different annealing process at two different time/growth metric, col. 8, line 7-20), or comparing an Etunnel value (see Etunnel values as shown in Figures 6-10; col. 8, lines 24-30), for different values of the growth metric (time) to provide a measure of the characteristic of the material on the substrate.

Still referring to claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 14 and 20, Xu does not specifically disclose that the characteristic of the material determined is the continuity of the material on the substrate, and/or the growth mode of the material.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Xu to determine the continuity and/or the growth mode/thickness of the material on the substrate, so as to detect the interested characteristics of the dielectric material on the substrate using the less expensive and nondestructive testing method to rapidly and accurately measure the semiconductor topography (col. 1, line 43-col. 2, line 43).

As for claims 2, 10, 12 and 15-19, Xu lacks the steps of comparing a first derivative of a Vtunnel/Etunnel per growth metric curve versus the growth metric; and determining a transition between a linear region and a non-linear region to determine the continuity and/or growth mode of the material on substrate, wherein the linear region corresponds to layer-to-layer growth of the material and the nonlinear region corresponds to islanded growth of the material on the substrate.

Art Unit: 2858

A person of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to further modify Xu to compare a first derivative of a Vtunnel/Etunnel per growth metric curve versus the growth metric to determine the growth mode of the material on the substrate, for its simplicity as compared to comparing a first order function of the film thickness.

Furthermore, A person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize a transition between a linear region and a non-linear region on the plot of the Vtunnel/Etunnel values.

As for claim 5, Xu discloses depositing a fixed amount of charge on the material (col. 7, lines 5-15).

As for claim 6, Xu discloses that the method is nondestructive (col. 7, lines 15-28; abstract) and can be used in-line (Figure 5).

As for claim 7, Xu discloses that the material is a high-k dielectric material (col. 6, line 26).

3. Claims 4, 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6, 759,255), in view of Jursich et al. (U. S. Pub. No. 2005/0003662).

As for claim 4, Xu discloses that the material is deposited on the substrate using CVD (col. 6, lines 15-25). Xu does not specifically disclose that the material is deposited on the substrate using Atomic Layer Deposition (ALD). Jursich et al. discloses that in thin film deposition for semiconductor fabrication, ALD is more desirable over CVD (see [0009]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Xu to use Atomic Layer Deposition (ALD), as taught by

Art Unit: 2858

Jursich et al., for depositing thinner and more uniform layers in the semiconductor devices ([0009]).

As for claims 8 and 13, Xu does not specifically disclose identifying optimum growth conditions for layer-by-layer deposition of the material on the substrate. Jursich et al. discloses setting optimum growth conditions ([0044], [0045], [0046], [0047] and [0048]). A person of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to modify Xu to identify optimum growth conditions for the deposition of the material, as taught by Jursich et al. for the purpose of depositing the dielectric material on the substrate more uniformly ([0044], [0045], [0046], [0047] and [0048]) in an ALD process.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy He whose telephone number is (571) 272-2230.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diane Lee can be reached on 571-272-2399. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2858

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AH May 16, 2006.

VINCENT Q. NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER